**A. Instructions to external assessors**

**A.1 General Instructions**

1. External assessors have access to the application packages uploaded by the applicants into EMS-ENI system.
2. Each project shall be assessed based on its merits, by using the information and documents available, provision of the *Guidelines for grant applicants,* the present manual, as well as any evaluation related instruction given by MA/JMC for clarification purposes. Subjective opinions on any of the questions/criteria from the evaluation grid shall be avoided.
3. Each project is assessed by 2 external assessors following the “four eyes” principle. One evaluation grid is compiled per project by each assessor.
4. In order to keep the pace of evaluation and avoid delays, at least **3 projects per week per assessor** shall be fully assessed. Each assessor shall manage his/her own working effort so that, at the end of each week, the set of projects is fully assessed, meets the quality requirements and is uploaded into EMS-ENI system. Exception is to be made only in case the assessor proposes PSC to request for clarifications.
5. Assessors shall work objectively and highly professional, any qualitative appreciation e.g. “good”, “poor”, “very good” needs to be followed by arguments and references to the project content.
6. Project content needs to be carrefully assessed against the evaluation criteria, one by one, and in the given order. The evaluation grid provides references to sections of the application package where related information can be found. Assessors are accountable if the information exists, but it was not evaluated.
7. In case full and objective verification of the project cannot be performed due to missing/incorrect information and/or documents, the assessor may propose PSC to request clarifications from the applicant by filling in an Explanatory Note (**Annex g\_6**). The respective project must not fall under the situations listed in **Annex EV\_2**.
8. PSC decides on the appropriateness of such requests, specifically if they might improve or modify the project content.
9. In case PSC decision is positive, based on the Explanatory Note, letter of clarifications is sent to the applicant. The respective assessor shall finalize evaluation based on the clarifications received, and may benefit of 1 extra-day to finish his/her work and upload the evaluation grid into EMS-ENI system. In case PSC decision is negative, evaluation must be finalized only by considering the information and documents available, and without any extra working time.
10. Only **2 clarification letters** per project can be made during this evaluation step, therefore the issues must be clearly and concisely explained in the respective Explanatory Note, per project and per partner. PSC secretary informs the assessors when clarifications are uploaded into EMS-ENI system.
11. PSC Secretary performs preliminary quality verification of the evaluation grids and may request revisions, if the case.
12. Based on the evaluation grids uploaded into EMS-ENI, PSC compiles one common evaluation grid per project and finally, the Evaluation Report (step 2).
13. In case of discrepancies between the present manual and the *Guidelines for grant applicants,* or situations not covered/regulated by the Manual, provisions of the *Guidelines for grant applicants* shall apply. In case the Guidelines or the Manual have no provisions for the respective situation, PSC shall decide on a case by case basis, by observing the working principles contained in the Manual.

**A.2 Specific instructions**

1. PSC secretary distributes weekly a new set of projects to each assessor. Each set contains at least 3 projects. Results of the work done is checked by PSC secretary on weekly basis and monitored by PSC coordinator. By the end of each week, each assessor is expected to deliver at least 3 evaluation grids meeting the quality requirements and upload them into EMS-ENI system or, if the case may be, Explanatory Notes proposing PSC to request clarifications from the applicants.
2. The scoring system is given by the evaluation grid and indicates the relative importance of the aspects to be analysed and weighed during evaluation. Particular attention must be paid to the eliminatory criteria set by the call since non-achievement of the minimum scores set by the call leads to project rejection.
3. Reasons for awarding maximum or minimum scores, as well as serious weaknesses leading to score reduction are indicated in the evaluation grid and must not be altered.
4. Comments will be done in English and scores awarded must be integer numbers.
5. In order to be accepted by PSC/JMC and not be subject for revision, any evaluation grid must satisfy the quality requirements:

⦁ Scores are awarded and comments are given for each evaluation criterion and,

⦁ Comments are consistent, project specific and coherent with the score awarded, references to the project are given. Comments synthesize the professional judgement made by the assessor and,

⦁ The Programme and the call requirements are fully met and,

⦁ Final conclusions and recommendations are project-specific, summarize the main strengths and weaknesses of the project, especially those related to project contribution to Programme indicators or actions to be taken by the Programme in case the project will be contracted.

1. PSC may request revision of the evaluation grid in case that:

⦁ The evaluation grid is incomplete or of poor quality e.g. has blank comment boxes, comments, conclusions and recommendations are weak or too general, not supporting the score awarded, they do not reflect the assessor’s opinion on the topic and do not support PSC/JMC in taking an informed decision.

⦁ Discrepancies between the scores and the given comments are identified

⦁ Scarce references to the project content are made

⦁ The Programme and the call requirements are not met.

1. An assessor shall not benefit of extra-time for evaluating the projects attributed in case that:

⦁ Evaluation grids needs revision or correction or,

⦁ PSC considers that requests of clarifications proposed are inappropriate.

1. In case that information lacks consistency in different parts of the application package, data provided in documents signed by the legal representatives shall prevail over the data inserted into the application form. In case of inconsistencies between different parts of the Applicvation Form, information leading to the most favourable decision for the project will be considered.

**EVALUATION GRID**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| pROJECT REGISTRATION NUMBER |  |
| CALL FOR PROPOSALS | **HARD** |
| assessor (NAME) |  |
| evaluation step | **Technical and financial evaluation** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT SYNOPSIS** | |
| Project Title |  |
| lEAD PARTNER |  |
| TYPE OF ACTION | HARD |
| TYPE OF PROJECT | integrated / symmetrical / single country |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **RELEVANCE & CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMME**   [The appropriateness of the project to the problems and needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and its contribution to the Programme are evaluated.] | | | | | |
| **1.1 RELEVANCE (max 30 points) – eliminatory section (min 15 points)** | | | | | |
| 1. **Needs analysis** (max score = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project impacts both sides of the border from the Programme area. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project is specific to the selected Programme Priority. | | |  |  |
| **2** | Target group(s) and final beneficiaries are described with all the necessary details required by the application form. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The analysis of the problem (causes and effects) is clear and logic, is clearly affecting the target group(s) and final beneficiaries chosen, official data is provided. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The solution proposed by the project is directly tackling the needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and brings positive change to those needs. The project General/ Specific Objectives are coherent with the solution proposed. | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Is the problem directly and clearly linked to the Programme priority addressed by the project?*  ***•*** *Does the project show appropriate knowledge of the problem to be addressed? Is consistent reference to official data, analysis, reports, statistics etc. made?*  ***•*** *Is the problem described affecting both sides of the border?*  ***•*** *Is the problem affecting**the FB & TG chosen?*  ***•*** *Is the problem presented inclear manner and shows the logical connection between causes and effects?*  ***•*** *Having in view the problem, are TGs & FBs appropriately chosen? Are they adequately described and realistically quantified e.g. TGs are not too large and rather FBs than TGs? Are TGs part of FBs?*  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge that FBs must benefit from the project, but on the long term? Are FBs directly linked to the General Objective?*  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge that TGs must take part to project activities and benefit from project results by the end of implementation? Are TGs directly linked to the Specific Objectives?* | |
| **5 - 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent, consistent, logic and reliable, although some details are missing or need corrections e.g. target groups and final beneficiaries) |
| **< 5** | **Poor** (statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, poor logic, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification, non-reliable or missing official data, lack of coherence between different levels of the needs’ analysis) |
| 1. **(b) Cross border impact of the project = ELIMINATORY[[1]](#footnote-1)** (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The cross border impact is described as long term benefits for both sides of the border from the Programme area (e.g. for project partners, target group or final beneficiaries). | | |  |  |
| **1** | The cross border approach supports achievement of the General/and Specific Objectives of the project. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The project puts into practice at least 2 cross border cooperation criteria, namely joint staffing and joint financing (comprising both grant and co-financing). | | |  |  |
| **C1.4 – C2.1 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge that impact represents long term benefits resulting from implementation of several projects in the same field?*  ***•*** *Can the impact be retrieved at the level of the General Objective?*  ***•*** *Does the impact described have clear cross character and touches upon FBs and TGs?*  ***•*** *Do you consider that the cross border approach enhances project’s prospects towards the General and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Are the mandatory cross border cooperation criteria (joint staffing, joint financing) effectively put into practice by the project?*  ***•***  *(per partner)**Does each project partner hold job descriptions for its team? Do project teams comprise at least one project manager/responsible and one financial manager/responsible from within the organizations?*  ***•*** *(per partner)**Are job descriptions sufficiently describing the main tasks related to the respective functions, in particular those regarding the project managers/responsibles and the financial managers/responsibles?*  ***•*** *(per partner)**Does each project partner manage a share of the project budget? Is each project partner providing a share of project co-financing?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent and consistent, although it could be more detailed. Each Partner has at least 1 project responsible and 1 financial responsible and manages a share of the project budget during implementation, job descriptions have been provided) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification/ description, the mandatory cooperation criteria are not fulfilled) |
| **(c) Project contribution to strategies and policies**  (max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The local/ regional/ national strategies/ policies indicated within the application form are relevant for the project field. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The General/ Specific Objectives of the project clearly contribute to the objectives of the respective strategies/ policies. | | |  |  |
| **1** | There is reference to past or current EU and other projects or initiatives that are relevant for the project field. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1 – C3.1– C3.2** | | **5** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *How relevant are the local/regional/national strategies/policies indicated to the project field and the particular problem to be addressed?*  ***•*** *Are any references given to the objectives of the strategies/policies mentioned?*  ***•*** *Is the project complementing and/or supporting the respective strategies/policies, in particular at the level of General and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Is the project a continuation or does it capitalize in any way on the results of other past/current EU/other projects/initiatives in the respective field?*  ***•*** *Is there clear presentation about how the project intends to build on such projects/initatives?*  ***•*** *Is the current programme particularly relevant for the project, or are there other EU/national programmes that could better support it?* | |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is reliable and coherent, although it could be more detailed) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. non-relevance and/ or weak link between the General/ Specific Objectives of the project and the strategies/ policies/ EU projects/ initiatives indicated) |
| **(d)** | **Cross cutting themes** (max score = 5 points) | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **5** | There is positive influence on more than one cross cutting theme of the Programme, project’s contribution during project lifetime and/or ex-post is clearly explained. Different sections of the application form are coherent is this respect e.g. target groups/ final beneficiaries, activities proposed, sustainability of project outputs and results. | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C4 – C8 – C9** | | **5** | **Very good** (the statement above is fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Does the project substantively take into consideration at least 1 Programme cross cutting theme?*  ***•*** *Is/Are the the cross cutting theme(s) addressed through mainly general statements or are there specific project interventions in this respect i.e. description of TGs&FBs, main outputs and results foreseen to be achieved, description of project activities, project sustainability?*  ***•*** *Is more than 1 Programme cross cutting theme addressed?*  ***•*** *Is any EU good practice in the respective area proposed to be implemented by the project? Will the TGs & FBs benefit of this approach?*  ***•*** *Is any original approach foreseen by the project in respect of the cross cutting theme(s) chosen?* | |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statement above is valid, at least 1 cross cutting theme is addressed by the project, the presentation is coherent and feasible, although some information could be more detailed/ there are minor inconsistencies between different sections of the application form) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statement above is not valid due to e.g. lack of coherence between different sections of the application form, poorly justified/non-reliable project contribution to at least 1 cross cutting theme) |
| * 1. **CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMME (max 20 points)** | | | | | |
| 1. **Contribution to Programme Result(s) ELIMINATORY[[2]](#footnote-2)**   (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **1** | The Programme Expected Result and the corresponding Programme Result Indicator are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |  |  |
| **4** | The General Objective of the project is clearly supporting the Programme Expected Result, contribution to the related Programme Result Indicator is consistently justified and achievable. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge the logical link between the Programme Expected Result and its General Objective?*  ***•*** *Is the project impact indicator directly contributing to at least one programme Result Indicator?*  ***•*** *Is the contribution clear, logical and significant?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective project contribution reliable and achievable on the long term?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of the Programme Expected Result and the related Result Indicator, contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Expected Result is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of a Programme Expected Result and/or the related Result Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator) |
| 1. **Contribution to Programme Output(s) ELIMINATORY [[3]](#footnote-3)**   (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **1** | The Programme Output(s) is/are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |  |  |
| **4** | The project Specific Objectives and Results are clearly contributing to more than one Programme Output(s) and the corresponding indicators, and are achievable during project lifetime. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge the logical link between the programme Outputs and its Specific Objectives and/or Results?*  ***•*** *Are indicators pertaining to project Specific Objectives and Results directly contributing to at least one programme Output indicator?*  ***•*** *Is this contribution clear and significant?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective project contribution reliable and achievable by the end of project lifetime?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of at least one Programme Output and the related Output Indicator, contribution of the project Specific Objectives to the Programme Output Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Output is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of at least one Programme Output and/or the related Output Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project Specific Objectives and Results to the Programme Output Indicator/ non-achievable during the project lifetime) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **PROJECT DESIGN (max 35 points)**   [Quality of the project intervention logic and of the project partnership are evaluated.] | | | | | | |
| * 1. **QUALITY OF THE INTERVENTION LOGIC (max 20 points)** | | | | | | |
| 1. **Project General Objective** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The General Objective is formulated as broader, long-term change of the situation of the target groups /final beneficiaries. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The General Objective meets SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicator(s) chosen to measure achievement of the General Objective are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Is the General Objective a solution to the problem described by the project?*  ***•*** *Does the General Objective show a change/improvement in FBs’ situation? Does it have the potential to become visible on the long term?*  ***•*** *Does the General Objective have clear cross border feature?*  ***•*** *Is an impact indicator foreseen to measure achievement of the General Objective? Is it reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective impact indicator reliable, having good prospects to be achieved on the long term and following contribution of several projects in the respective area?*  ***•*** *Is the impact indicator chosen cheap and simple, or does it require a lot of time and resources to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicator?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the General Objective and the related indicator(s) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the General Objective, related indicator(s) are oversized/ inappropriately chosen) |
| **(b) Project Specific Objectives** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives are formulated as improvements of the situation of the target groups/ final beneficiaries (see sections C1.1, C1.2 and C1.3), and are clearly contributing to achievement of the project General Objective. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Specific Objectives at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the Specific Objectives a solution to the problem described by the project?*  ***•*** *Are the Specific Objectives leading to achievement of the project General Objective (if – then clause)?*  ***•*** *Do the Specific Objectives bring an improvement in TGs’ situation?*  ***•*** *Do the Specific Objectives have clear cross border feature?*  ***•*** *Are indicators foreseen to measure achievement of the Specific Objectives? Are they properly formulates and reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective indicators reliable, feasible to be achieved following exclusively the project intervention and by the end of its lifetime?*  ***•*** *Are the respective indicators cheap and simple, or do they require a lot of time and project resources in order to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicators?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Good** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Specific Objectives and the related indicators) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Specific Objectives, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(c)** | **Project results** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The project Results are formulated as clear benefits for the target groups /final beneficiaries and are contributing to achievement of the Specific Objectives. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Results meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Results at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the project Result expressed as benefits for the TGs?*  ***•*** *Are the Results leading to achievement of the Specific Objectives (if – then clause)?*  ***•*** *Are indicators foreseen to measure achievement of the project Results? Are they properly formulated i.e. not as activities, and reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective indicators reliable, feasible to be achieved following exclusively the project intervention and by the end of its lifetime?*  ***•*** *Are the Result indicators cheap and simple, or do they require a lot of time and project resources in order to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicators?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Results and the related indicators |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Results, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(d)** | **Project Main Outputs** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **3** | The Main Outputs are works, supplies and/ or services to be delivered by the project and are mandatory to achieve the stated Results. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Main Outputs of the project are achievable within the project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the Main Outputs indispensable to achieve project Results (if – then clause), or are they rather regular project deliverables?*  ***•*** *Are Main Outputs achievable following project activities?*  ***•*** *Can they be realized during project lifetime?*  ***•*** *Is there a balanced contribution of project partners to the achievement of Main Outputs?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some details or minor corrections are needed) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed due to e.g. lack of clarity, lack of logic) |
| **2.2 QUALITY OF THE PROJECT PARTNERSHIP (max 15 points)** | | | | | | |
| 1. **Relevance of the project partnership ELIMINATORY[[4]](#footnote-4)**   (Min score = 3 points; Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | | Project Partners have the necessary competencies required in the field of the project. | | |  |  |
| **3** | | The Partners chosen including, if the case, those located outside the core regions, clearly support achievement of the project Results and objectives. If applicable, the participation of Partners located outside the programme area is well substantiated, and required by the nature and project objectives. | | |  |  |
| **B1 – C4 (all GAs) – C6.2 – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Following analysis of the statutory documents provided, can you conclude that project partners have clear competencies in the project field?*  ***•*** *As such, do partners support achievement of project Results and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Are they involved in a balanced way in project activities?*  ***•*** *In case of partners from outside the Programme area, is their participation in the project sufficiently and consistently justified?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (project Partners have competencies in the project field, they adequately support achievement of the project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, if their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives, the score given cannot be more than 2 points “poor”) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, some Partners do not have the competencies necessary in the project field or have unclear contribution to achievement of project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives) |
| **(b) Previous experience and financial capacity of the project partnership** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | | More than 50% of the project Partners have participated in/ managed at least 2 EU[[5]](#footnote-5)/ other internationally funded projects. The Applicant has managed at least 1 EU[[6]](#footnote-6)/ other internationally funded project. Partners’ do not subcontract management of their share of the project. | | |  |  |
| **2** | | Each Partner shows reliable sources of funding in the previous year, there is good balance between the share of grant requested, and the financial resources available. Each partner provides a share of co-financing during project implementation. | | |  |  |
| **1** | | Except for public authorities, all Partners have functioned for at least 3 years before the year of submission of the proposal. | | |  |  |
| **B1 – C6.2 – C8 – Budget – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Have the project partners implemented any EU/other internationally funded projects?*  ***•*** *If “YES”, have the project partners worked before on similar issues as those described by the project?*  ***•*** *With reference to partners’ experience in project management,**is there evidence that grants of similar size have been managed before?*  ***•*** *Following analysis of the financial documents, can you conclude that partners have stable and sufficient sources, adequate to cover the stated co-financing, as well as ineligible expenditure or any other costs related to its implementation?*  ***•*** *In respect of project sustainability, as the case may be, are partners able to financially support project Results from their own resources? Or do they mainly rely on their capacity to attract external funding? Do costs needed to maintain the project results in operation overrun the financial posibilities of the project partners?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: at least 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed at least 1 EU/ other internationally funded project; most of the Partners do not subcontract management of their share of the project; Partners show adequate sources of funding in the previous year) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, in particular: less than 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed EU/ other internationally funded projects, including the Applicant who intends to subcontract project management; Partners have small financial resources when compared to the grant requested or availability/ continuity of these resources is questionable) |
| 1. **Partners’ contribution to the project**   (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | Distribution of responsibilities between the project Partners is well balanced and adequate to their competencies and previous experience. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | Ratio between the total amount of budget line 4.2.1 *(Office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 10%. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Each Partner contributes to project implementation with staff, office and equipment. | | | |  |  |
|  | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Do partners’ competencies complement each other and thus support project implementation?*  ***•*** *Are partners involved in project activities based on their needs and/or competencies?*  ***•*** *Are all the partners involved in GA0 Project preparation, GA1 Project management, GA2 Information and communication plan?*  ***•*** *In case the project addresses specific needs of certain project partners, are they participating to capacity building activities?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per function)**Is the time foreseen to be worked for the project in accordance to responsibilities of the respective function and the share of project activities entrusted to the respective partner?*  ***•*** *Do partners provide at least basic resources to support project implementation (e.g. location having the necessary utilities, basic IT equipment and internet connection etc.)?*  ***•*** *Is the office equipment to be purchased necessary and reasonable, as quantities and costs, when compared to project size and complexity?* | |
| **C1.5 – C4 (all GAs) – Budget** | | | **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: responsibilities assigned to project Partners are compliant to competencies and previous experience; each Partner has some contribution to the project with staff, office and/or equipment; the ratio between total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 20%) |
|  | | | **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inadequate assignment of responsibilities to project Partners when compared to their competencies and experience; the ration between the total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is more than 20%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **PROJECT VIABILITY (max 95 points)**   **[**The project’s capacity to be successfully implemented and to continue after the end of EU financing is evaluated.] | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1 TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY (max 25 points)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **(a) Project preparedness**[[7]](#footnote-7)(Max score = 5 points) | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | Project stakeholders are identified, they have participated to its development, some of them will benefit of capacity building/ information and communication activities during project implementation as target groups/ final beneficiaries | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | The project has been well prepared in advance, Partners have been involved in its preparation. The preparatory steps undertaken are clearly described. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#0, GA#1, GA#4) – C5** | | | **5** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Have the main stakeholders been duly considered by the project, from preparation to closure, and also for the sustainability period?*  ***•*** *Is evidence that they were and will be involved beyond the mere information? Are they a specific TG or, at least, are they among the FBs?*  ***•*** *Has the project been attentively prepared in advance and, as such, there is high probability to have it implemented within the stated period?* | | |
| **3 - 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: some major stakeholders participate to the project; preparatory actions have been undertaken and project Partners have been involved) | | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: major project stakeholders have not been consulted/ involved in project preparation, and they are not part of the target groups and/ or final beneficiaries; the project does not fill in GA#0) | | |
| **(b) Project management** (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **3** | Project coordination and management, including communication between Partners, is clearly presented in all the aspects related to project implementation (e.g. decision making process, activities and budget management, allocation of resources, collection and exchange of information between Partners). | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Procedures for self-monitoring (e.g. of project activities, outputs, results and budget) and reporting (drafting and submission of reports and payment requests) are clearly described and support project implementation. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | Main external and internal risks are properly identified, measures foreseen are adequate and realistic. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | The information and communication plan is adequate to the project size and to the target groups/ final beneficiaries’ specificities, and goes over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#2, GA#3)** | | | **10** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Does the project ensure that “project management” minimum requirements are met? Description of GA1 Project management is concise, coherent and focused on the main project management activities?*  ***•*** *Are main “management” actions are clearly described by the project i.e. partners’ coordination, communication, decision making, management of activities and of the grant, reporting, internal project monitoring? Do partners have clear roles in respect of project management?*  ***•***  *Are the main internal and external project risks identified? Is the project foreseeing measures o adequately mitigate/prevent them?*  ***•*** *Are all project partners participating/responsible for communication and information activities?* | | |
| **6 – 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: coordination and day-to-day management, as well as self-monitoring mechanisms are adequate; major risks have been taken into account and measures to tackle them are adequate; the communication strategy is well designed but it does not go over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. More details are needed on these issues) | | |
| **< 6** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inappropriate coordination and day-to-day project management; lack of knowledge concerning the project self-monitoring and its purpose; unclear framework to meet the reporting obligations; some major risks were not taken into account and/ or measures to tackle them are inappropriate/ missing; poor communication strategy) | | |
| **(c) Project planning & methodology**  (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **3** | Project activities are clear, logically sequenced and necessary to achieve the intended Main Outputs within the project lifetime. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | The methodology gives sufficient details about how activities are to be performed e.g. role of project partners, targets to be achieved (outputs, deliverables). | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Activities adequately involve the target groups/ final beneficiaries, including those activities to be performed outside the core regions. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | The timeframe of activities is appropriate. The project is feasible within the duration proposed. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 – C6 – C6.1 – C7** | | | **10** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *(per GA)**Are project activities practical, logically andr cronologically sequenced?*  ***•*** *Are project activities necessary to achieve Main Outputs and to project Results?*  ***•*** *(per activity) Are all the necessary details given to describe each project activity e.g. start/end month, partners involved, methodology, TGs involved, and deliverables?*  ***•*** *(per activity) Is the timeframe proposed adequate for performing the respective activity? Is there any activity that could be implemented in a shorter period of time? Are there activities that will surely need a longer period of time? Is the stated duration a risk for the project when considering its size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Is therean optimal distribution of activities during the project lifetime e.g. are periods in which quite high number of activities is foreseen, or quite high number of Main Outputs are planned to be achieved? Are there periods in which no activity is planned by the project?*  ***•*** *Do project activities overlap in any way the current activities of the partners?* | | |
| **5 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: activities are necessary to achieve the Main Outputs, and logically sequenced, although the timeframe could be improved and/or some corrections would be needed; resources are reasonably used. In case of activities to be performed outside the core regions, if benefits the target groups/ final beneficiaries are not demonstrated by the project, reduction of costs should be proposed. | | |
| **< 5** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: weak link between the activities and the Main Outputs; inappropriate timeframe jeopardizing project implementation; unclear/ inadequate methodology; poor involvement of the target groups/ final beneficiaries) | | |
| **3.2 FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY (max. 10 points)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Project budget** (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | The budget is mathematically correct. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are eligible and compliant with requirements of the Programme and of the Call for proposals. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are well detailed and justified according to Programme instructions. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are necessary and they are directly related to/ generated by project activities. The budget proposed is efficiently used to achieve the intended project Main Outputs and Results. | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are reasonable when compared to current market prices | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 – Budget** | | | **10** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *(per partner)**Are project activities fully reflected as costs in the individual budget i.e. directly releted to/generated by project activities?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per budget line and heading) Are all the details justifying a cost given?*  ***•*** *(per partner) Is there coherence and consistency between project activities as decribed in the Application Form and Annex A.2 Justification of costs?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per budget line and heading) Are costs stated under the relevant budget line and heading?*  ***•*** *(per partner) Are there any ineligible costs?*  ***•*** *(per project) Have thresholds set by the programme been met?*  ***NOTES***  ***!!!*** *In case of budget reductions, amounts to be cut must be indicated per budget line and per partner, with justifications.*  ***!!!*** *After reductions, thresholds at project level must be re-calculated.*  ***!!!*** *Total amount of reductions, is deducted from the project budget. The precentage representing the grantis kept and applied to the revised total of eligible costs. The grant amount and the co-financing to be provided at project level will then result.*  ***!!!*** *If not foreseen by the project, compulsory costs must be nevertheless provided by the projectfrom resources outside the grant requested and the stated co-financing i.e. by increasing the co-financing amount.* | | |
| **5 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: the budget is overall mathematically correct; costs are sufficiently described, eligible and compliant with the requirements, although some details/ minor corrections/ clarifications would be needed; costs are overall reasonable when compared to market prices; there is correspondence between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results) | | |
| **< 5** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. large number of mathematical mistakes, poor description of costs, large number of inconsistencies between the budget and description of activities, non-compliance between the costs and the requirements, overestimated costs when compared to market prices; discrepancies between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results s) | | |
| **3.3 THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENT (max 55 points)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Added value of the infrastructure component (Max score = 10 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **5** | | The infrastructure component is one of the project’s Results and clearly contribute to one Programme Output. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **5** | | Besides of the contribution above, the infrastructure component supports achievement of another Programme Output and/or Result. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C2.1** | | | | **10** | | **Very good** (both statements above are valid) | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project correctly put into practice the definition given by the programme in the Guidelines in respect of the infrastructure?*  ***•*** *Has the infrastructure been correctly linked to one programme Output?*  ***•*** *Is the project contribution to the respective Output direct, clearly and consistently presented?*  ***•*** *Does the respective infrastructure bring significant contribution to programme Outputs i.e. does the project address more than one programme Output? Does the project support to faster and better achieve programme targets?* | | |
| **5** | | **Adequate** (only first statement is valid, there is no contribution to another Programme Output and/or Result) | |
| **0** | | **Poor** (statements above are not valid) | |
| 1. **Justification for the infrastructure component (considering all the partners involved) (Max score = 5 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **1** | | The need for the infrastructure component is explicitly part of the problem(s) identified by the project. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **1** | | Execution of the infrastructure component is justified as part of the solution identified by the project. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | | There is clear justification in what concerns the relevance of the infrastructure component for both sides of the border. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C1.2 – C1.3 – C1.4** | | | | **5** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Can infrastructure be retrived as part of the problem described by the project?*  ***•*** *Is evidence that execution of the infrastructure component will bring changes in FBs/TGs situation?*  ***•*** *Does execution of the infrastructure positively affect both sides of the border? Are the respective effects clearly described? Is description coherent and reliable, or it contains mainly statements hardly to become visible?* | | |
| **3 - 4** | | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, although reference to the infrastructure component when describing the needs of the target groups and the solution proposed by the project could have been more consistent, and its relevance for both sides of the border is reasonably explained) | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. no/poor references to the infrastructure component when analysing the needs and the solution proposed by the project, the infrastructure component benefits to only one side of the border) | |
| 1. **Description of the infrastructure component (Max score = 10 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | | All the necessary details are provided to identify the location(s) where the infrastructure component is to be executed. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **8** | | Description of the infrastructure component gives sufficient and clear details on the technical, functional and economic specifications of the works to be executed and/ or equipment to be installed. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#4)** | | | | **10** | | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Does description of the infrastructure provide clear data on its main technical, functional and economic indicators i.e. characteristics and parametres, functionalities, or it rather focuses on the technical solution?*  ***•*** *Can the programme have a clear image on its purposes and functionalities?*  ***•*** *As described, do you consider that the infrastructure component can rendered as fully functional by the end of project lifetime?* | | |
| **5 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, location(s) details are given, description of the infrastructure could be more detailed, but information missing is not crucial ) | |
| **< 5** | | **Poor** (the statements above are not valid due to e.g. vague/ missing details on the location(s) of the infrastructure, important information on technical, functional and/or economic specifications is missing) | |
| 1. **Technical feasibility of the infrastructure component (Max score = 15 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | | Authorizations/ permits required for the execution of the infrastructure are listed, some of them are already available. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | The ownership status over the locations where the infrastructure component is to be executed is clearly presented. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | The sequence of activities covers the major stages in executing of the infrastructure, and is logically sequenced. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | | The timing of the activities foreseen is appropriate to the size and/ or complexity of the infrastructure component envisaged. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | The main outputs contributing to the infrastructure component are clearly described. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | Information about the strategy for operating and maintaining the infrastructure component at the end of the project is clear (stages, methods, indicative resources are indicated). | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | Risks associated with the infrastructure component are clear and fully listed, appropriate measures to prevent and/ or mitigate them are foreseen by the project. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#4 and GA#1)** | | | | **15** | | | **Very good** (the statement above is fully valid) | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Are main authorizations/permits necessary to execute/operate the infrastructure listed according to the legislation in force?*  ***•*** *Could the ownership status of the location (land/building/space) rise any issue in case the project is to be financed by the programme?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Are the Main Outputs clearly leading to project Results, or are they rather project deliverables?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Are the stated activities necessary to achieve the Main Outputs?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Are some mandatory activities missing?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Are activities logically sequenced?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Are the details necessary to describe each project activity given e.g. start/end month, partners involved, methodology, TGs involved, deliverables?*  ***•*** *(per GA4) Is the timeframe proposed adequate for executing each activity? Is any activity that could be implemented in a shorter period of time? Is any activity that will surely need a longer period of time? Is the stated duration for executing the infrastructure realistic, or it is a risk considering the infrastructure’s size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Does the project foresee a clear strategy for operating and maintaining the infrastructure after the project ends?*  ***•*** *Have the main risks related to the infrastructure been listed? Are appropriate measures foreseen to prevent/mitigate the risks?* | | |
| **8 - 14** | | | **Adequate** (each of the statements above receive at least 1 point, some details/ explanations/ clarifications would be needed, but they do not impact on further project evaluation/ implementation) |
| **< 8** | | | **Poor** (there are statements which do not receive at least 1 point due to e.g. lack of clarity, logic, important details, and the impact on further project evaluation and implementation could be decisive) |
| 1. **Financial feasibility of the infrastructure component (Max score = 10 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | | Costs[[8]](#footnote-8) are eligible and compliant with requirements of the Programme and of the Call for proposals. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | Costs[[9]](#footnote-9) are in line with the description of the infrastructure given at GA Infrastructure. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | Costs[[10]](#footnote-10) are necessary for executing the infrastructure component. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | Costs[[11]](#footnote-11) are reasonable when compared to costs of similar infrastructure, or to standard costs for infrastructure having similar technical characteristics. | | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | | **Is the project eligible under this Call for proposals (the infrastructure component amounts to at least 1 million EUR)?** | | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#4) – Budget (Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown)** | | | | **10** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure) Are costs for GA4 correctly and fully reflected in the individual budget i.e. directly related to/generated by project activities?*  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure and per budget line and heading) Are all the details justifying the costs given per budget line and heading?*  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure) Is there coherence and consistency between the Application Form and Annex A.2 Justification of costs?*  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure) Is there coherence and consistency between the individual budget and Annex Infrastructure budget breakdown?*  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure) Are costs stated under the relevant budget lines and headings?*  ***•*** *(per partner executing a share of infrastructure) Are there any ineligible costs?*  ***•*** *(per project) Is there compliance with the budget thresholds and the eligibility requirements set by the programme?* | | |
| **6 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: costs are eligible, necessary (given the description provided GA#4), compliant with the requirements, some corrections/ clarifications would be needed, but they are not crucial; costs seem reasonable when compared to costs of similar infrastructures, or standard costs for infrastructure having similar technical characteristics)  In case the infrastructure component is less than 1 million EUR, the project will be rejected. | |
| **< 4** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. large number of ineligible costs, inconsistencies between the GA#4 and the *Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown*, wide range of overestimated costs) | |
| 1. **Capacity building activities (Max score = 5 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | | **Score** |
| **1** | | Capacity building is part of the problem(s) identified by the project. | | | | | |  | |  |
| **1** | | Capacity building is part of the solution identified by the project. | | | | | |  | |  |
| **2** | | Capacity building activities are adequate to specificities of those benefitting e.g. project partners, target groups, final beneficiaries. They are adequate considering the project size and complexity. | | | | | |  | |  |
| **1** | | Capacity building activities are detailed along GAs and properly summarized at section C5. | | | | | |  | |  |
| **C1.2 – C1.3 - C4 (all GAs with capacity building activities) – C5** | | | | **5** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Is lack of/low capacities part of the problem described, or of the solution proposed by the project?*  ***•*** *Are capacity building activities clearly described?*  ***•***  *Is capacity building going beyond small-sized meetings or excanges of experience between the project partners?*  ***•*** *Is evidence that capacity building activities bring added-value and changes /improvements in FBs/TGs situation?* | | |
| **3 – 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, although the need/solution identified by the project could refer in more detail to the capacity building) | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. no/poor references to the needs/ solution identified, inadequacy of the capacity building activities to the beneficiaries, lack of coherence between sections C4 and C5) | |
| **3.4 SUSTAINABILITY (max 5 points)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **(a) Sustainability of project Outputs and Results (Max score = 5 points)** | | | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | | **Score** |
| **2** | Sustainability analysis is consistent and related to project Results and Main Outputs. | | | | | | |  | |  |
| **3** | Measures proposed are realistic, affordable, and verifiable, responsibilities are clear. In case of projects with an infrastructure component, measures to preserve the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure are described and feasible (art.39 point 3 from 897/2014 IR). | | | | | | |  | |  |
|  | | | **5** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid | | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Does sustainability analysis consider continuation of project Results and Main Outputs?*  ***•*** *Will structures be in place and keep providing the services developed by the project?*  ***•*** *Will TGs/FBs/stakeholders continue to benefit of/interested in project Results and Main Outputs after its end?*  ***•*** *Is there evidence that local/regional/national authorities, as appropriate, will continue to support project Results and Main Outputs? Are such mechanisms/budget/resources described by the project?*  ***•*** *Have all financial, institutional, policity, environmental sustainability aspects been considered by the project beyond the mere statements, but in a practical and consistent manner?*  ***•*** *Has the project taken into consideration environmental strategies/policies in force in the respective area/field?*  ***•*** *In case project Results and Main Outputs are to be replicated/maintained after its end, have the necessary financial resources been realistically estimated? Are reliable sources identified by partners?* | | |
| **3 - 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: sustainability measures are related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are adequate, feasible and verifiable after project completion, although they would need some details/ clarifications) | | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: sustainability measures are not related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are expensive/ unrealistic/ cannot be verified after completion; there are serious doubts that, in case of a project with an infrastructure component, the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure will be maintained) | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **STATE AID ASSESSMENT**   [To verify if the project contains state aid elements.] | | | |
| **NO[[12]](#footnote-12)** | **YES** | **CRITERIA** | **Comments and references to the project** |
|  |  | Are public resources involved? |  |
|  |  | Are public resources granted selectively to the beneficiaries? |  |
|  |  | Is any beneficiary of the project an “undertaking”? |  |
|  |  | Does any beneficiary (“undertaking”) and/or a third party (“undertaking”) get an economic advantage that it could not normally get from the market? |  |
|  |  | Does the aid (financing of the project) distorts or threatens to distort competition and trade between Member States, and/or between Member States and participant countries? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SCORES & SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS** | |
|  | 1. **Project relevance**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Quality of project design**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Project viability**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **State Aid Assessment**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | **Maximum score = 180 points** |

**EVALUATION GRID**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| pROJECT REGISTRATION NUMBER |  |
| CALL FOR PROPOSALS | **SOFT** |
| assessor (NAME) |  |
| evaluation step | **Technical and financial evaluation** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT SYNOPSIS** | |
| Project Title |  |
| lEAD PARTNER |  |
| TYPE OF ACTION | SOFT |
| TYPE OF PROJECT | integrated / symmetrical / single country |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **RELEVANCE & CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMME**   [The appropriateness of the project to the problems and needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and its contribution to the Programme are evaluated.] | | | | | |
| **1.1 RELEVANCE (max 30 points) – eliminatory section (min 15 points)** | | | | | |
| 1. **Needs analysis** (max score = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project impacts both sides of the border from the Programme area. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project is specific to the selected Programme Priority. | | |  |  |
| **2** | Target group(s) and final beneficiaries are described with all the necessary details required by the application form. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The analysis of the problem (causes and effects) is clear and logic, is clearly affecting the target group(s) and final beneficiaries chosen, official data is provided. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The solution proposed by the project is directly tackling the needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and brings positive change to those needs. The project General/ Specific Objectives are coherent with the solution proposed. | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Is the problem directly and clearly linked to the Programme priority addressed by the project?*  ***•*** *Does the project show appropriate knowledge of the problem to be addressed? Is consistent reference to official data, analysis, reports, statistics etc. made?*  ***•*** *Is the problem described affecting both sides of the border?*  ***•*** *Is the problem affecting**the FB & TG chosen?*  ***•*** *Is the problem presented inclear manner and shows the logical connection between causes and effects?*  ***•*** *Having in view the problem, are TGs & FBs appropriately chosen? Are they adequately described and realistically quantified e.g. TGs are not too large and rather FBs than TGs? Are TGs part of FBs?*  ***•***  *Did the project aknowledge that FBs must benefit from the project, but on the long term? Are FBs directly linked to the General Objective?*  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge that TGs must take part to project activities and benefit from project results by the end of implementation? Are TGs directly linked to the Specific Objectives?* | |
| **5 - 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent, consistent, logic and reliable, although some details are missing or need corrections e.g. target groups and final beneficiaries) |
| **< 5** | **Poor** (statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, poor logic, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification, non-reliable or missing official data, lack of coherence between different levels of the needs’ analysis) |
| 1. **(b) Cross border impact of the project = ELIMINATORY[[13]](#footnote-13)** (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The cross border impact is described as long term benefits for both sides of the border from the Programme area (e.g. for project partners, target group or final beneficiaries). | | |  |  |
| **1** | The cross border approach supports achievement of the General/and Specific Objectives of the project. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The project puts into practice at least 2 cross border cooperation criteria, namely joint staffing and joint financing (comprising both grant and co-financing). | | |  |  |
| **C1.4 – C2.1 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge that impact represents long term benefits resulting from implementation of several projects in the same field?*  ***•*** *Can the impact be retrieved at the level of the General Objective?*  ***•*** *Does the impact described have clear cross character and touches upon FBs and TGs?*  ***•*** *Do you consider that the cross border approach enhances project’s prospects towards the General and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Are the mandatory cross border cooperation criteria (joint staffing, joint financing) effectively put into practice by the project?*  ***•*** *(per partner)**Does each project partner hold job descriptions for its team? Do project teams comprise at least one project manager/responsible and one financial manager/responsible from within the organizations?*  ***•*** *(per partner)**Are job descriptions sufficiently describing the main tasks related to the respective functions, in particular those regarding the project managers/responsibles and the financial managers/responsibles?*  ***•*** *(per partner)**Does each project partner manage a share of the project budget? Is each project partner providing a share of project co-financing?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent and consistent, although it could be more detailed. Each Partner has at least 1 project responsible and 1 financial responsible and manages a share of the project budget during implementation, job descriptions have been provided) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification/ description, the mandatory cooperation criteria are not fulfilled) |
| **(c) Project contribution to strategies and policies**  (max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The local/ regional/ national strategies/ policies indicated within the application form are relevant for the project field. | | |  |  |
| **2** | The General/ Specific Objectives of the project clearly contribute to the objectives of the respective strategies/ policies. | | |  |  |
| **1** | There is reference to past or current EU and other projects or initiatives that are relevant for the project field. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1 – C3.1– C3.2** | | **5** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *How relevant are the local/regional/national strategies/policies indicated to the project field and the particular problem to be addressed?*  ***•*** *Are any references given to the objectives of the strategies/policies mentioned?*  ***•*** *Is the project complementing and/or supporting the respective strategies/policies, in particular at the level of General and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Is the project a continuation or does it capitalize in any way on the results of other past/current EU/other projects/initiatives in the respective field?*  ***•*** *Is there clear presentation about how the project intends to build on such projects/initatives?*  ***•*** *Is the current programme particularly relevant for the project, or are there other EU/national programmes that could better support it?* | |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is reliable and coherent, although it could be more detailed) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. non-relevance and/ or weak link between the General/ Specific Objectives of the project and the strategies/ policies/ EU projects/ initiatives indicated) |
| **(d)** | **Cross cutting themes** (max score = 5 points) | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **5** | There is positive influence on more than one cross cutting theme of the Programme, project’s contribution during project lifetime and/or ex-post is clearly explained. Different sections of the application form are coherent is this respect e.g. target groups/ final beneficiaries, activities proposed, sustainability of project outputs and results. | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C4 – C8 – C9** | | **5** | **Very good** (the statement above is fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Does the project substantively take into consideration at least 1 Programme cross cutting theme?*  ***•*** *Is/Are the the cross cutting theme(s) addressed through mainly general statements or are there specific project interventions in this respect i.e. description of TGs&FBs, main outputs and results foreseen to be achieved, description of project activities, project sustainability?*  ***•*** *Is more than 1 Programme cross cutting theme addressed?*  ***•*** *Is any EU good practice in the respective area proposed to be implemented by the project? Will the TGs & FBs benefit of this approach?*  ***•*** *Is any original approach foreseen by the project in respect of the cross cutting theme(s) chosen?* | |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statement above is valid, at least 1 cross cutting theme is addressed by the project, the presentation is coherent and feasible, although some information could be more detailed/ there are minor inconsistencies between different sections of the application form) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statement above is not valid due to e.g. lack of coherence between different sections of the application form, poorly justified/non-reliable project contribution to at least 1 cross cutting theme) |
| * 1. **CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMME (max 20 points)** | | | | | |
| 1. **Contribution to Programme Result(s) ELIMINATORY[[14]](#footnote-14)**   (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **1** | The Programme Expected Result and the corresponding Programme Result Indicator are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |  |  |
| **4** | The General Objective of the project is clearly supporting the Programme Expected Result, contribution to the related Programme Result Indicator is consistently justified and achievable. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge the logical link between the Programme Expected Result and its General Objective?*  ***•*** *Is the project impact indicator directly contributing to at least one programme Result Indicator?*  ***•*** *Is the contribution clear, logical and significant?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective project contribution reliable and achievable on the long term?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of the Programme Expected Result and the related Result Indicator, contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Expected Result is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of a Programme Expected Result and/or the related Result Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator) |
| 1. **Contribution to Programme Output(s) ELIMINATORY [[15]](#footnote-15)**   (Min score = 6 points; Max score = 5 x 2 = 10 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **1** | The Programme Output(s) is/are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |  |  |
| **4** | The project Specific Objectives and Results are clearly contributing to more than one Programme Output(s) and the corresponding indicators, and are achievable during project lifetime. | | |  |  |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Did the project aknowledge the logical link between the programme Outputs and its Specific Objectives and/or Results?*  ***•*** *Are indicators pertaining to project Specific Objectives and Results directly contributing to at least one programme Output indicator?*  ***•*** *Is this contribution clear and significant?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective project contribution reliable and achievable by the end of project lifetime?* | |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of at least one Programme Output and the related Output Indicator, contribution of the project Specific Objectives to the Programme Output Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Output is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of at least one Programme Output and/or the related Output Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project Specific Objectives and Results to the Programme Output Indicator/ non-achievable during the project lifetime) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **PROJECT DESIGN (max 35 points)**   [Quality of the project intervention logic and of the project partnership are evaluated.] | | | | | | |
| * 1. **QUALITY OF THE INTERVENTION LOGIC (max 20 points)** | | | | | | |
| 1. **Project General Objective** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The General Objective is formulated as broader, long-term change of the situation of the target groups /final beneficiaries. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The General Objective meets SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicator(s) chosen to measure achievement of the General Objective are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Is the General Objective a solution to the problem described by the project?*  ***•*** *Does the General Objective show a change/improvement in FBs’ situation? Does it have the potential to become visible on the long term?*  ***•*** *Does the General Objective have clear cross border feature?*  ***•*** *Is an impact indicator foreseen to measure achievement of the General Objective? Is it reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective impact indicator reliable, having good prospects to be achieved on the long term and following contribution of several projects in the respective area?*  ***•*** *Is the impact indicator chosen cheap and simple, or does it require a lot of time and resources to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicator?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the General Objective and the related indicator(s) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the General Objective, related indicator(s) are oversized/ inappropriately chosen) |
| **(b) Project Specific Objectives** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives are formulated as improvements of the situation of the target groups/ final beneficiaries (see sections C1.1, C1.2 and C1.3), and are clearly contributing to achievement of the project General Objective. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Specific Objectives at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the Specific Objectives a solution to the problem described by the project?*  ***•*** *Are the Specific Objectives leading to achievement of the project General Objective (if – then clause)?*  ***•*** *Do the Specific Objectives bring an improvement in TGs’ situation?*  ***•*** *Do the Specific Objectives have clear cross border feature?*  ***•*** *Are indicators foreseen to measure achievement of the Specific Objectives? Are they properly formulates and reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective indicators reliable, feasible to be achieved following exclusively the project intervention and by the end of its lifetime?*  ***•*** *Are the respective indicators cheap and simple, or do they require a lot of time and project resources in order to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicators?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Good** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Specific Objectives and the related indicators) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Specific Objectives, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(c)** | **Project results** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | The project Results are formulated as clear benefits for the target groups /final beneficiaries and are contributing to achievement of the Specific Objectives. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Results meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Results at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |  |  |
| **C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the project Result expressed as benefits for the TGs?*  ***•*** *Are the Results leading to achievement of the Specific Objectives (if – then clause)?*  ***•*** *Are indicators foreseen to measure achievement of the project Results? Are they properly formulated i.e. not as activities, and reasonably quantified in accordance with the project size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Do you consider the respective indicators reliable, feasible to be achieved following exclusively the project intervention and by the end of its lifetime?*  ***•*** *Are the Result indicators cheap and simple, or do they require a lot of time and project resources in order to be collected and measured?*  ***•*** *Are appropriate sources of verification indicated to document achievement of the respective indicators?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Results and the related indicators |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Results, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(d)** | **Project Main Outputs** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **3** | The Main Outputs are works, supplies and/ or services to be delivered by the project and are mandatory to achieve the stated Results. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | The Main Outputs of the project are achievable within the project lifetime. | | | |  |  |
| **C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Are the Main Outputs indispensable to achieve project Results (if – then clause), or are they rather regular project deliverables?*  ***•*** *Are Main Outputs achievable following project activities?*  ***•*** *Can they be realized during project lifetime?*  ***•*** *Is there a balanced contribution of project partners to the achievement of Main Outputs?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some details or minor corrections are needed) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed due to e.g. lack of clarity, lack of logic) |
| * 1. **QUALITY OF THE PROJECT PARTNERSHIP (max 15 points)** | | | | | | |
| 1. **Relevance of the project partnership ELIMINATORY[[16]](#footnote-16)**   (Min score = 3 points; Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | | Project Partners have the necessary competencies required in the field of the project. | | |  |  |
| **3** | | The Partners chosen including, if the case, those located outside the core regions, clearly support achievement of the project Results and objectives. If applicable, the participation of Partners located outside the programme area is well substantiated, and required by the nature and project objectives. | | |  |  |
| **B1 – C4 (all GAs) – C6.2 – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Following analysis of the statutory documents provided, can you conclude that project partners have clear competencies in the project field?*  ***•*** *As such, do partners support achievement of project Results and Specific Objectives?*  ***•*** *Are they involved in a balanced way in project activities?*  ***•*** *In case of partners from outside the Programme area, is their participation in the project sufficiently and consistently justified?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (project Partners have competencies in the project field, they adequately support achievement of the project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, if their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives, the score given cannot be more than 2 points “poor”) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, some Partners do not have the competencies necessary in the project field or have unclear contribution to achievement of project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives) |
| **(b) Previous experience and financial capacity of the project partnership** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | | More than 50% of the project Partners have participated in/ managed at least 2 EU[[17]](#footnote-17)/ other internationally funded projects. The Applicant has managed at least 1 EU[[18]](#footnote-18)/ other internationally funded project. Partners’ do not subcontract management of their share of the project. | | |  |  |
| **2** | | Each Partner shows reliable sources of funding in the previous year, there is good balance between the share of grant requested, and the financial resources available. Each partner provides a share of co-financing during project implementation. | | |  |  |
| **1** | | Except for public authorities, all Partners have functioned for at least 3 years before the year of submission of the proposal. | | |  |  |
| **B1 – C6.2 – C8 – Budget – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Have the project partners implemented any EU/other internationally funded projects?*  ***•*** *If “YES”, have the project partners worked before on similar issues as those described by the project?*  ***•*** *With reference to partners’ experience in project management,**is there evidence that grants of similar size have been managed before?*  ***•*** *Following analysis of the financial documents, can you conclude that partners have stable and sufficient sources, adequate to cover the stated co-financing, as well as ineligible expenditure or any other costs related to its implementation?*  ***•*** *In respect of project sustainability, as the case may be, are partners able to financially support project Results from their own resources? Or do they mainly rely on their capacity to attract external funding? Do costs needed to maintain the project results in operation overrun the financial posibilities of the project partners?* | |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: at least 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed at least 1 EU/ other internationally funded project; most of the Partners do not subcontract management of their share of the project; Partners show adequate sources of funding in the previous year) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, in particular: less than 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed EU/ other internationally funded projects, including the Applicant who intends to subcontract project management; Partners have small financial resources when compared to the grant requested or availability/ continuity of these resources is questionable) |
| 1. **Partners’ contribution to the project** (Max score = 5 points) | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** |
| **2** | Distribution of responsibilities between the project Partners is well balanced and adequate to their competencies and previous experience. | | | |  |  |
| **2** | Ratio between the total amount of budget line 4.2.1 *(Office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 10%. | | | |  |  |
| **1** | Each Partner contributes to project implementation with staff, office and equipment. | | | |  |  |
|  | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Do partners’ competencies complement each other and thus support project implementation?*  ***•*** *Are partners involved in project activities based on their needs and/or competencies?*  ***•*** *Are all the partners involved in GA0 Project preparation, GA1 Project management, GA2 Information and communication plan?*  ***•*** *In case the project addresses specific needs of certain project partners, are they participating to capacity building activities?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per function)**Is the time foreseen to be worked for the project in accordance to responsibilities of the respective function and the share of project activities entrusted to the respective partner?*  ***•*** *Do partners provide at least basic resources to support project implementation (e.g. location having the necessary utilities, basic IT equipment and internet connection etc.)?*  ***•*** *Is the office equipment to be purchased necessary and reasonable, as quantities and costs, when compared to project size and complexity?* | |
| **C1.5 – C4 (all GAs) – Budget** | | | **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: responsibilities assigned to project Partners are compliant to competencies and previous experience; each Partner has some contribution to the project with staff, office and/or equipment; the ratio between total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 20%) |
|  | | | **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inadequate assignment of responsibilities to project Partners when compared to their competencies and experience; the ration between the total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is more than 20%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **PROJECT VIABILITY (max 40 points)**   **[**The project’s capacity to be successfully implemented and to continue after the end of EU financing is evaluated.] | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1 TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY (max 25 points)** | | | | | | | | |
| **(a) Project preparedness**[[19]](#footnote-19)(Max score = 5 points) | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | Project stakeholders are identified, they have participated to its development, some of them will benefit of capacity building/ information and communication activities during project implementation as target groups/ final beneficiaries | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | The project has been well prepared in advance, Partners have been involved in its preparation. The preparatory steps undertaken are clearly described. | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#0, GA#1, GA#4) – C5** | | **5** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Have the main stakeholders been duly considered by the project, from preparation to closure, and also for the sustainability period?*  ***•*** *Is evidence that they were and will be involved beyond the mere information? Are they a specific TG or, at least, are they among the FBs?*  ***•*** *Has the project been attentively prepared in advance and, as such, there is high probability to have it implemented within the stated period?* | | |
| **3 - 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: some major stakeholders participate to the project; preparatory actions have been undertaken and project Partners have been involved) | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: major project stakeholders have not been consulted/ involved in project preparation, and they are not part of the target groups and/ or final beneficiaries; the project does not fill in GA#0) | |
| **(b) Project management** (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **3** | Project coordination and management, including communication between Partners, is clearly presented in all the aspects related to project implementation (e.g. decision making process, activities and budget management, allocation of resources, collection and exchange of information between Partners). | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Procedures for self-monitoring (e.g. of project activities, outputs, results and budget) and reporting (drafting and submission of reports and payment requests) are clearly described and support project implementation. | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | Main external and internal risks are properly identified, measures foreseen are adequate and realistic. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | The information and communication plan is adequate to the project size and to the target groups/ final beneficiaries’ specificities, and goes over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 (GA#2, GA#3)** | | **10** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *Does the project ensure that “project management” minimum requirements are met? Description of GA1 Project management is concise, coherent and focused on the main project management activities?*  ***•*** *Are main “management” actions are clearly described by the project i.e. partners’ coordination, communication, decision making, management of activities and of the grant, reporting, internal project monitoring? Do partners have clear roles in respect of project management?*  ***•***  *Are the main internal and external project risks identified? Is the project foreseeing measures to adequately mitigate/prevent them?*  ***•*** *Are all project partners participating/responsible for communication and information activities?* | | |
| **6 – 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: coordination and day-to-day management, as well as self-monitoring mechanisms are adequate; major risks have been taken into account and measures to tackle them are adequate; the communication strategy is well designed but it does not go over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. More details are needed on these issues) | |
| **< 6** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inappropriate coordination and day-to-day project management; lack of knowledge concerning the project self-monitoring and its purpose; unclear framework to meet the reporting obligations; some major risks were not taken into account and/ or measures to tackle them are inappropriate/ missing; poor communication strategy) | |
| **(c) Project planning & methodology**  (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **3** | Project activities are clear, logically sequenced and necessary to achieve the intended Main Outputs within the project lifetime. | | | | |  |  | |
| **3** | The methodology gives sufficient details about how activities are to be performed e.g. role of project partners, targets to be achieved (outputs, deliverables). | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Activities adequately involve the target groups/ final beneficiaries, including those activities to be performed outside the core regions. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | The timeframe of activities is appropriate. The project is feasible within the duration proposed. | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 – C6 – C6.1 – C7** | | **10** | | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *(per GA)**Are project activities practical, logically andr cronologically sequenced?*  ***•*** *Are project activities necessary to achieve Main Outputs and to project Results?*  ***•*** *(per activity) Are all the necessary details given to describe each project activity e.g. start/end month, partners involved, methodology, TGs involved, and deliverables?*  ***•*** *(per activity) Is the timeframe proposed adequate for performing the respective activity? Is there any activity that could be implemented in a shorter period of time? Are there activities that will surely need a longer period of time? Is the stated duration a risk for the project when considering its size and complexity?*  ***•*** *Is there an optimal distribution of activities during the project lifetime e.g. are periods in which quite high number of activities is foreseen, or quite high number of Main Outputs are planned to be achieved? Are there periods in which no activity is planned by the project?*  ***•*** *Do project activities overlap in any way the current activities of the partners?* | | |
| **5 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: activities are necessary to achieve the Main Outputs, and logically sequenced, although the timeframe could be improved and/or some corrections would be needed; resources are reasonably used. In case of activities to be performed outside the core regions, if benefits the target groups/ final beneficiaries are not demonstrated by the project, reduction of costs should be proposed. | |
| **< 5** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: weak link between the activities and the Main Outputs; inappropriate timeframe jeopardizing project implementation; unclear/ inadequate methodology; poor involvement of the target groups/ final beneficiaries) | |
| **3.2 FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY (max. 10 points)** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Project budget** (Max score = 10 points) | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | **Score** | |
| **2** | The budget is mathematically correct. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are eligible and compliant with requirements of the Programme and of the Call for proposals. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are well detailed and justified according to Programme instructions. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are necessary and they are directly related to/ generated by project activities. The budget proposed is efficiently used to achieve the intended project Main Outputs and Results. | | | | |  |  | |
| **2** | Costs are reasonable when compared to current market prices | | | | |  |  | |
| **C4 – Budget** | | **10** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) | | ***Questions to orient the assessment***  ***•*** *(per partner)**Are project activities fully reflected as costs in the individual budget i.e. directly releted to/generated by project activities?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per budget line and heading) Are all the details justifying a cost given?*  ***•*** *(per partner) Is there coherence and consistency between project activities as decribed in the Application Form and Annex A.2 Justification of costs?*  ***•*** *(per partner and per budget line and heading) Are costs stated under the relevant budget line and heading?*  ***•*** *(per partner) Are there any ineligible costs?*  ***•*** *(per project) Have thresholds set by the programme been met?*  ***NOTES***  ***!!!*** *In case of budget reductions, amounts to be cut must be indicated per budget line and per partner, with justifications.*  ***!!!*** *After reductions, thresholds at project level must be re-calculated.*  ***!!!*** *Total amount of reductions, is deducted from the project budget. The precentage representing the grantis kept and applied to the revised total of eligible costs. The grant amount and the co-financing to be provided at project level will then result.*  ***!!!*** *If not foreseen by the project, compulsory costs must be nevertheless provided by the projectfrom resources outside the grant requested and the stated co-financing i.e. by increasing the co-financing amount.* | | |
| **5 - 9** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: the budget is overall mathematically correct; costs are sufficiently described, eligible and compliant with the requirements, although some details/ minor corrections/ clarifications would be needed; costs are overall reasonable when compared to market prices; there is correspondence between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results) | |
| **< 5** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. large number of mathematical mistakes, poor description of costs, large number of inconsistencies between the budget and description of activities, non-compliance between the costs and the requirements, overestimated costs when compared to market prices; discrepancies between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results s) | |
|  | | | **3 – 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, although the need/solution identified by the project could refer in more detail to the capacity building) |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. no/poor references to the needs/ solution identified, inadequacy of the capacity building activities to the beneficiaries, lack of coherence between sections C4 and C5) |
| **3.3 SUSTAINABILITY (max 5 points)** | | | | | | | | |
| **(a) Sustainability of project Outputs and Results (Max score = 5 points)** | | | | | | **Comments and references to the project** | | **Score** |
| **2** | Sustainability analysis is consistent and related to project Results and Main Outputs. | | | | |  | |  |
| **3** | Measures proposed are realistic, affordable, and verifiable, responsibilities are clear. In case of projects with an infrastructure component, measures to preserve the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure are described and feasible (art.39 point 3 from 897/2014 IR). | | | | |  | |  |
|  | | **5** | | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid | | ***Questions to guide the assessment***  ***•*** *Does sustainability analysis consider continuation of project Results and Main Outputs?*  ***•*** *Will structures be in place and keep providing the services developed by the project?*  ***•*** *Will TGs/FBs/stakeholders continue to benefit of/interested in project Results and Main Outputs after its end?*  ***•*** *Is there evidence that local/regional/national authorities, as appropriate, will continue to support project Results and Main Outputs? Are such mechanisms/budget/resources described by the project?*  ***•*** *Have all financial, institutional, policity, environmental sustainability aspects been considered by the project beyond the mere statements, but in a practical and consistent manner?*  ***•*** *Has the project taken into consideration environmental strategies/policies in force in the respective area/field?*  ***•*** *In case project Results and Main Outputs are to be replicated/maintained after its end, have the necessary financial resources been realistically estimated? Are reliable sources identified by partners?* | | |
| **3 - 4** | | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: sustainability measures are related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are adequate, feasible and verifiable after project completion, although they would need some details/ clarifications) | |
| **< 3** | | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: sustainability measures are not related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are expensive/ unrealistic/ cannot be verified after completion; there are serious doubts that, in case of a project with an infrastructure component, the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure will be maintained) | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **STATE AID ASSESSMENT**   [To verify if the project contains state aid elements.] | | | |
| **NO[[20]](#footnote-20)** | **YES** | **CRITERIA** | **Comments and references to the project** |
|  |  | Are public resources involved? |  |
|  |  | Are public resources granted selectively to the beneficiaries? |  |
|  |  | Is any beneficiary of the project an “undertaking”? |  |
|  |  | Does any beneficiary (“undertaking”) and/or a third party (“undertaking”) get an economic advantage that it could not normally get from the market? |  |
|  |  | Does the aid (financing of the project) distorts or threatens to distort competition and trade between Member States, and/or between Member States and participant countries? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SCORES & SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS** | |
|  | 1. **Project relevance**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Quality of project design**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Project viability**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **State Aid Assessment**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | **Maximum score = 125 points** |

1. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Project stakeholders are individuals, groups of people, institutions or firms that may have a relationship with the project and may (directly or indirectly, positively or negatively) affect or be affected by the project results. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Per category, as comprised in the budget sheet *Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Per category, as comprised in the budget sheet *Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown* [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Per category, as comprised in the budget sheet *Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown* [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Per category, as comprised in the budget sheet *Indicative infrastructure budget breakdown* [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. At least one NO given to these criteria means that no State Aid is involved by the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Scores will be multiplied by 2 because of their importance [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Project stakeholders are individuals, groups of people, institutions or firms that may have a relationship with the project and may (directly or indirectly, positively or negatively) affect or be affected by the project results. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. At least one NO given to these criteria means that no State Aid is involved by the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)